Case No.: 08-53439 RLE

Adversary No. 10-05112

Chapter 13

DEFENDANT MORTGAGEIT, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT IN ADVERSARY PROCEEDING

July 29, 2010 Date: 10:30 a.m. Time: Place: Courtroom 3099

May 11, 2010 Compl. Filed: Not Yet Set Trial Date:

Honorable Roger L. Efremsky

Filed concurrently with: Notice of Motion to Dismiss Memorandum of Points and Authorities Request for Judicial Notice

REED SMITH LLP

28

MOTION TO DISMISS

2 3

1

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

Defendant MortgageIT, Inc. ("MortgageIT"), will and hereby does move, pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7012(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), for an order dismissing all claims alleged against MortgageIT in the Complaint of plaintiffs Jesus Gutierrez Galindo and Alicia Galindo ("Plaintiffs") in the adversary proceeding for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. The Court should grant MortgageIT's motion to dismiss all of Plaintiff's claims pursuant to Fed. Bankr. R. P. 7009 and 7012 as well as Fed. R. Civ. P. 9 and 12(b)(6) on the following grounds:1

All of Plaintiffs' claims fail because they are barred by the *res judicata* doctrine. The identical claims alleged in Plaintiffs' Complaint were already dismissed by this Court in March 2010. Iin any event, each of Plaintiffs' claims fail on the following bases:

Plaintiffs' Second Claim for Violation of the Truth in Lending Act ("TILA") fails because Plaintiffs do not allege facts supporting rescission.

Plaintiffs' Third Claim for Fraud fails because Plaintiffs' Complaint fails to set forth facts sufficient to establish a claim for fraud against MortgageIT and the facts that are pled fail to meet the heightened standard of specificity required for fraud claims.

Plaintiffs' Fourth Claim for Rescission Based Upon Violation of California Civil Code Section 1632 fails because this statutory provision does not apply to MortgageIT based on the facts pled in the Complaint.

¹ Plaintiffs allege seven causes of action in their Complaint. Plaintiffs' first cause of action for Violation of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act and sixth cause of action for Objection to Claim of WaMu are directed at defendants other than MortgageIT.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiffs' Fifth Claim for Determination of Extent and Validity Of Lien fails because: (1) Plaintiffs acknowledge that MortgageIT does not hold the current interest in the Loan; and (2) Plaintiffs' fraud allegations are insufficiently pled under the heightened pleading standard.

Plaintiffs' Seventh Claim for Under California Civil Code Section 3345 fails because: (1) this statutory provision provides for a form of relief, not an independent cause of action; and (2) Plaintiffs fail to allege a basis for this form of relief as to MortgageIT.

The Court should dismiss all claims alleged in the Complaint with prejudice because they are unsupported by the law and/or unsupported by the facts of this case as against MortgageIT for the reasons explained more fully in the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

This Motion is based on the Notice of Hearing on Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed concurrently herewith, the pleadings and papers on file herein, and upon such other and further matters as may be presented at the hearing.

DATED: June 11, 2010. REED SMITH LLP

> /s/ Christopher O. Rivas Lorenzo Gasparetti (SBN 135976) Karen A. Braje (SBN 193900) Kristine H. Chen (SBN 239925) Christopher O. Rivas (SBN 238765) Attorneys for Defendant MortgageIT, Inc.

US ACTIVE-103838297.2